(b) The names of Taluks which were not included under this Scheme are as follows :—

(1) Hirekerur	(4) Kalgatgi
(2) Hangal	(5) Byadgi
(3) Shiggaon	(6) Savanur

REPRESENTATION

SRI A. LAKSHMI SAGAR.—Sir, I would like to bring to the kind notice of the Hon'ble Minister for Health that the last date for submitting application for the admission to MBBS Degree Courses was 30-6-1982. The B.Sc. graduates are also eligible for admission to these courses and some quota is reserved for them. But, the results of B.Sc. Degree examinations are not so far announced. Therefore, the time for sending up of applications by B.Sc. students who would be successful in their examinations for admission to MBBS Degree Courses must be extended atleast by 15 days from the date of announcement of the B.Sc. Degree Examination results.

SRI A.K. ABDUL SAMAD.—Sir, by evening I will make an announcement about this on the floor of the House.

ಶ್ರೀ ಹೆಚ್.ಎಲ್. ತಿಮ್ಮೇಗೌಡ.—ಪಿ.ಯು.ಸಿ. ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ನಿನ್ನೆ ದಿವಸವೇ ಕೊನೆಯ ದಿನವಾಗಿದೆ. ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳಿಗೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಮಾರ್ಕ್ಸ್ ಕಾರ್ಡುಗಳು ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಒಂದು ವಾರ ವಿಸ್ತರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

SRI M.C. NANAIAH —Sir, in many places, the students have not received the marks cards.

SRI A.K. ABDUL SAMAD.—I will consider about this also.

PRIVILAGE MOTION

Reg : Announcement made by a Minister about establishing a mini-hydro electric Project in Private Sector.

SRI A. LAKSHMI SAGAR.—Sir, the next point is about the notice of privilege given by us. I would like to bring to the kind notice of this House the following facts by way of preliminary submission. Sir, the matter arose on a Privilege Notice given in respect of a policy decision purported to have been made by the Secretary, Public Works Department. The answer to that was, it does not involve policy decision since it was a statement made by the Secretary, Public Works Department. The Hon'ble Minister for Public Works Sri Kagodu Thimappa came and announced in the midst of the discussion that the policy decision purported to have been made by the Secretary, Public Works Department at Mysore is not a policy

decision. The Government had taken such a decision in the Cabinet meeting held on 11-8-1981. Pursuant to such a decision, the Secretary to the Government, Public Works Department made a statement purported to have been made by him at Mysore. If that is so, nothing wrong about it is my submission. Sir, the Hon'ble Minister for Finance in his Budget Speech has stated thus:

"ಖಾಸಗಿ ವಲಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಸಣ್ಣ ಜಲವಿದ್ಯುತ್ ಯೋಜನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸುವ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸುತ್ತಿದೆ"

That means, the Government is considering the possibility of establishing Hydro-Electric Projects in private sector. The policy, the possibility of such an establishment of hydro-electric projects in private sector is under the consideration of the Government. Now, he cannot go back from his speech. Now, this is the latest statement of the Hon'ble Finance Minister, a statement made without the knowledge of the previous decision of the Government of which he is a party. Therefore, it is a clear case of misleading the House when he made the statement during the course of his budget speech. This is a matter of breach of privilege of this House as contemplated under Rule 177 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Legislative Assembly. This is a matter which establishes *prima facie* a case of breach of privilege of this House and therefore my submission is that proper action should be taken in this behalf and the matter may be referred to the Committee on Privileges. This is my submission.

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY.—Sir, I have gone through the statement of the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition. In fact the policy decision to go in for involvement of the private sector under the mini Hydel Project was taken as far back as July 1981. That has been made clear. We took the dacision in the cabinet on 11/8/1981. But the proposals have not been cleared by the private parties. If the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition goes through my speech, he will notice that I have carefully worded as follows :

"Government are also actively considering the proposal for establishing mini Hydro-Electric Projects in the private sector."

That proposal is cleared only in June 1982, only after I made the statement in the budget on 17-3-1982. When I made my statement in the budget, the proposals were not cleared at that time and they were before the Government.

MR. SPEAKER.—What was the decision taken according to you ?

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY.—Sir, the policy decision was taken in August 1981 to go in for the concept of establishing a mini Hydel

Project. Just because the policy decision or the concept was accepted in August 1981, that does not mean that the proposals by the respective parties are cleared. That was not done as on the date of my budget speech. I cannot say that proposals have been sanctioned or the proposals have been approved. I can say that only after we take a decision with reference to the offer made by the party, that offer becomes the proposal before the Government. It is only after the proposals are accepted, that we can say and those proposals or the offer made by the private parties were under consideration at the time, I made the budget speech. That is how I said that those proposals were under active consideration of the Government and those proposals were approved only on 3rd June 1982, only after I delivered my budget speech. It is quite clear. I would have misled this august House if I had said that proposals have been approved or proposals have been agreed to. I could have said that only after the cabinet takes a decision and approves such proposals and that was done in June 1982 and not prior to June 1982. So, we have absolutely no intention to mislead this House. I should be precise over the matter instead of putting things in more ambiguity or in vague terms. I have clearly stated that the proposals are under active consideration. I did not say that proposals have been sanctioned.

SRI M. C. NANAIAH.—Sir, I want to know from the Hon'ble Finance Minister, the meaning of the term 'proposals to set up mini Hydel Projects under the private sector.' For the information of this august House and for the information of the Hon'ble Finance Minister, let me quote from his budget speech. In the English version, it reads thus :

> "Government are also actively considering the proposals for establishing mini Hydel Projects in the private sector."

Government are actively considering the proposals in addition to what the Government would do in respect of all other projects.

Now, the Kannada version reads thus :

> "ಖಾಸಗಿ ವಲಯದಲ್ಲೂ ಸಣ್ಣ ಜಲ ವಿದ್ಯುತ್ ಯೋಜನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸುವ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾವವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸುತ್ತಿದೆ."

Sir, in the budget speech, if the Hon'ble Finance Minister had said that the Government had already decided to set up the Hydro Electric projects under the private sector, I would have agreed, to the interpretation given by him. But now he says that the proposals which he means were the proposals as to whom it should be given were under the active consideration of the Government. Sir, it does not give that meaning. Sir, I would like to take this House through

the budget speech of the Hon'ble Finance Minister for the year 1981. Not a word is said that the Government are activley considering setting up of mini Hydel Projects under the private sector. If the Government had taken a decision in the year 1981 to set up three projects under the private sector, nothing would have prevented the Hon'ble Finance Minister to make it very specific and inform the House so far as the policy decision is concerned, a major deviation from the policy. The Government in principle had accepted the proposal to have mini Hydel Electric Projects under the private sector and the proposals to whom it should be given are under the active consideration of the Government. This would have been the speech of the Minister. Would it give that meaning when you say that the Government are actively considering the proposals to set up mini Hydel Projects under the private sector ? Would it mean to say that the Government have already taken a decision earlier and the proposals as to whom it should be given are pending before the Government ? Because we have sent the privilege notice, I would not like the Hon'ble Finance Minister to come forward and say that he is very careful in wording his statement. If it is capable of any other interpretation other than the one Government are only considering the proposal of setting of units, would it mean that the Government have already decided to set up the projects under the private sector ? I would request the Hon'ble Speaker to give interpretation to this. A normal reading would not give such an interpretation to this. I would very much say that the Hon'ble Finance Minister is not correct in saying that the proposals which he has mentioned in his budget speech are the proposals of the individuals which were pending before the Government for consideration. Would it mean that ? My submission to the Hon'ble Speaker is that when the Goverument had taken a decision in the year 1981, i.e., on 11-8-1981 in the cabinet itself, what would have prevented the Minister to specify in the budget speech ? Yesterday, a statement was made. Are we not setting up the Diesel Generation of energy ? From where are you going to give water, whether from Krishna or Cauvery? How much water has to be realised ? What would be the total involvement and for how many years ? Are they not the policy decisions of the Government? The Minister has stated in his budget speech that these proposals are there to augment the energy source and now he is telling that the proposals were the proposals of the private parties for the purpose of giving contract. This is not the real interpretation. I would request the Hon'ble Speaker to give a correct interpretationto this. I do not know as to who is correct.

MR. SPEAKER.—The Government have placed both the factls One is that they have taken a decision as early as in the year 1981, in respect of having Hydro Electric projects in the private sector and according to the clarification that is now made by the Finance Minister the proposals were there on that day and they were not cleared. Since they were not cleared...

SRI M. C. NANAIAH.—I would request the Hon'ble Speaker to go through the whole matter and find out whether this ..

MR. SPEAKER.—Supposing for argument sake, if the earlier decision of the Government, namely taking a decision of establishing the Hydro Electric projects under the private sector was suppressed, I could have understood that the Hon'ble Minister is misleading the House. But he says that both are facts namely the decision of the Government was there which was taken as early as in August 1981 and the proposals were not cleared.

SRI M. C. NANAIAH.—Sir, the point is that this is the major deviation from the policy of the Government. If the Hon'ble Finance Minister had specifically mentioned in his Budget Speech that the Government in principle had accepted to give to the private parties to set up mini Hydel Projects, we could have discussed it in detail during our discussion on the General Budget.

But now this is *fait accompli* wherein they have said that they have already given contract to three individuals. The *fait accompli* has been established by the Government and prevented us from making our observations and prevented us from telling the Government that they are taking a wrong step. Whether it is a correct step or a wrong step, the Members would have got an opportunity to speak. What is it that the hon. Minister has stated in the Budget speech ? All the Members would have spoken whether this is a wise step or not. By making a *fait accompli* now we are in a position to give a notice to the Speaker and say that a breach of privilage has been committed and this House has been misled. This is all that we can do at this moment. I would very much request the Speaker to go through the whole issue and give us an opportunity because the intentions of the Government in this...

MR. SPEAKER.— In the light of the explanation offered by the Hon. Finance Minister placing both the facts on the floor of the House and clarifying and correcting the situation, still I should.

SRI M, C. NANAIAH.— But what about the point made from our side ? To that extent did they not suppress ?

MR. SPEAKER.— The demands are coming up for discussion. You can raise at that time.

SRI M. C. NANAIAH.— The question would be *fait accompli* Contracts are already given.

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY.— Mr. Speaker Sir,...

MR. SPEAKER.— Anyway the Officer should not make such statements.

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY.— Mr. Speaker Sir, Let me submit one fact. Suppose the decision of the Cabinet of August 1981. had been suppressed and then I had mentioned this, the argument of the hon. Member would be correct,

MR. SPEAKER.— The hon. Members gave me a notice of privilege in respect of the announcement made by the Secretary, Public Works Department, at Mysore, on the previous day stating that when the House was in session, making a major policy statement outside the House was not according to the conventions and all that and thereby there is a breach of privilege. That was the notice given. But during the course when the matter was under discussion and when the hon. Minister of State for Power was explaining certain things. he made a statement for the fiirst time stating that the decision in respect of permitting the projects was taken as early as August 1981 and, therefore, there was not a major deviation of the policy. He said that policy decision was already taken by the Government and it was not a new thing which has been given publicity outside the House.

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY.— It was given publicity. The decision taken by the Cabinet in August 1981 was subsequently given publicity in the Press. Cabinet decision was published in the press; The Cabinet took a decision approving the concept of establishing mini-hydle projects. That was a policy decision taken,

MR. SPEAKER.— That is the point he also made. Supposing a decision was there, there could have been a mention of it in the Budget that in the light of the decision taken the proposals have been cleared,

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY.— Not like that. The decision was taken by the Cabinet in August 1981 and that policy decision was duly pronounced in the Press. It was known to the entire public and also the hon. Members. In pursuance of that we had to take action with regard to clearance of proposals. The details were not known. In the Budget Speech all these details are not mentioned. It is not an administrative report. While the policy decision is taken in August 1981, there is no point in giving the details in the Budget Speech. It is for the respective Departments to report the details. I will be questioned if I do not mention about the action taken in

pursuance of that policy decision. This is the action taken as far as the policy decision taken is concerned. I made a mention in my Budget Speech about the action taken in pursuance of that policy decision which was taken in August 1981. What was the consequent decision ? Clearing up the proposals. Those proposals as on date of my Budget Speech were not clear. I cannot say proposals are to be cleared. There should be an offer by the parties and then that becomes the proposal before the Government. At that time it was not clear. If the Government were to suppress the policy decision taken, I could have understood the hon. Members argument. If the Cabinet has taken a decision and we have not pronounced it. I can understand. We have to spell out the policy decision. The decision of the Cabinet is very clear. Approval of the concept of establishment of mini hydel projects was the decision of the Cabinet in August 1981. We can quote papers. That has already been pronounced. The Cabinet decision has not been kept a secret. It has been announced. My Budget Speech indicates only action to be taken consequent to that policy decision. My announcement is not a policy decision. I do not claim that this statement is the policy announcement. It is only with reference to the action taken on the policy decision taken in August 1981. There is absolutely no ground to say that. We cannot imagine why should we suppress it. I have to report. Of course, details are not given. Many times they are not given. These details are given in the administrative Reports or when the respective demands come up for discussion. The Cabinet took a decision on 11th August 1981 and it was conveyed to the Government of India, the Central Electricity Authority and the Planning Commission on 27th August 1981. We have to get clearance from the Government of India and the Government of India will have to clear it. Then only we can entertain the proposals. All this process is there. I do not claim that my Budget Speech is a policy announcement. It is only action taken in terms of the policy decision taken already. There is absolutely no intention on the part of the Government to suppress it. Afterall we are require to know all the decisions the Government taken from time to time not only through the Budget Speech but other announcements also. Opportunity was available to the Members. It was known to the entire world that we are going in for a mini-hydel project through private sector. If the hon. Members were to rely only on Budget Speech and not the other announcements made by the Government from time to time.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.— The hon. Minister now making the decision known to the whole world. The cabinet decision was not at all announced in the Press.

MR. SPEAKER.— The hon. Minister says that it was published. Now it is for you to verify. He says immediately after the decision of the Cabinet, it was given to the press. There was publicity. Public were given notice of it. That is what he says.

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY.— The decision of 11th August 1981 has not been kept secret.

SRI M. C. NANAIAH.— Why did you not spell it out in your Budget Speech ?

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY.—Why should I ?

SRI M.C. NANAIAH.—What is the language used in the Budget Speech ? Let us under stand. I must say the hon. Minister must go back to the english school to know what is the interpretation of this. If he were to give the interpretation as he does, he should go to the grammar class or should go to the Kannada class to understand what Kannada language is.

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR.—Sir. I request you to kindly read the English sentence and also the Kannada sentence.

MR. SPEAKER.—I have read both. In the light of the clarification offered by the hon. Minister.

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR.—I understand. The sentence is : "The Government are also actively considering the proposal for establishing minihydro electric project in the private sector". The syntactical meaning, the etymological meaning and the meaning of the words which compose the sentense are not by an stretch of imagination capable of importing a meaning which the hon. Minister wants us to believe. If the sentence is capable of.....

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ವಿಷಯ ಏನಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಎರಡು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಸದನದ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಷ್ಟೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಡಿಸಿಷನ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು Inpursuance of that proposal ಆ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಕ್ಲೀಯರ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಬಜೆಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ತದನಂತರ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಕ್ಲಾರಿಫೈ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ.....

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀಸಾಗರ್.—ತಮಗೆ ಆರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಇಷ್ಟೆ.....

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು,—ಅವರು ಮುಂದೆ ಒಂದು ಹೆಜ್ಜೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀಸಾಗರ್.—ಇದು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇತ್ತು. ನಾವು ಹಿಂದೆ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದೂ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿದ್ದು ಅದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮುಚ್ಚಿಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ನಮ್ಮಿಂದ ನಡೆದಿಲ್ಲ ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಂ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿಗಳು ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥದ್ದು ಅಂಥ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ನೀತಿಗೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾದ ಘೋಷಣೆ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಅರ್ಥ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ವಾಕ್ಯ ವ್ಯಾಕರಣಬದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ಕರ್ತೃ, ಕರ್ಮ, ಕ್ರಿಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ವಾಕ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಅರ್ಥದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಕೊಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯ ? ಇದನ್ನು ತಾವು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಆಗ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ೧೦೦ ವಿದವಾದಂಥ ವಿವರಣೆ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು, ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ವಾಕ್ಯದ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ತಾವು ತಿಳಿದುಕೂಂಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಯಾವ

ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಾದರೂ ಕೂಡಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಹೃದಯದಿಂದ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿಬಿಟ್ಟು ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ವಾಕ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಜಾಗವಿದ್ದರೆ ನೋಡಿ. ಮಟಮಟ ಮಧ್ಯಾಹ್ನದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾವಿರ ಕ್ಯಾಂಡಲ್ ಬಲ್ಬ್‌ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡು ನೋಡಿದರೂ ಅರ್ಥ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆಷ್ಟು ತಾವು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ತಮ್ಮ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್.ಎಲ್. ತಿಮ್ಮೇಗೌಡ.--ದಿನಾಂಕ ೧೦-೮-೧೯೮೧ರಂದು ಕ್ಯಾಬಿನೇಟ್ ಡಿಸೀಷನ್ ಆಗಿ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದರೆ ಪ್ಲಾನಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ಮತ್ತು ಸೆಂಟ್ರಲ್ ಗೌರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್‌ಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.--ಸರ್ಕಾರ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್.ಎಲ್. ತಿಮ್ಮೇಗೌಡ.-- ೧೦-೮-೧೯೮೧ರಲ್ಲಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ೧೨ ಅಥವಾ ೧೩ನೇ ತಾರೀಖು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿರಬೇಕು. ೧೨, ೧೩ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನಮಗೆ ತೋರಿಸಿ ?

MR. SPEAKER.—You have raised privilege motion and it is your job to search the paper.

SRI M.C. NANAIAH.—Sir, till then our notice may be kept pending. We will also look into that.

MR. SPEAKER.—Nothing prevents you to give another notice after verifying the matter. But in view of the clarification made by the Hon'ble Finance Minister I don't think that notice would survive.

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, the matter is not so simple because they have already approved projects of certain private parties. The budget speech indicates that the Government is still considering.

MR. SPEAKER.—What the leader of the opposition and Dr. R.L. Thimmegowda were telling was.....

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—Regarding implications.....

MR. SPEAKER.--Not only implication, but....

(Interruptions)

೧೦-೮-೧೯೮೧ರಲ್ಲಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ಸಭೆಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ತದನಂತರ ಪ್ರಪೋಸಲ್ಸ್ ಇತ್ತು. ಬಜೆಟ್ ಭಾಷಣ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಪ್ರಪೋಸಲ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಅನುಮತಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY.--I would like to make a submission so that our hon. members may know about it. Even when we took a policy decision on 11-8-1981 we were under the impression that Government of India's clearance is necessary for such works because that was the new innovation which we ventured upon. At that time the concurrence of the Government of India was not there and in the absence of that I cannot say that proposals are cleared. Therefore, we sought the concurrence of the Government of India. We wrote to them on 27-8-1981. To our letter Government of India replied that

up to a capacity of 25 megawatts permission of the Government of India is not necessary. As on that date even offer for that capacity was not available with us otherwise we could have cleared some of the projects. When we were told that the State Government can itself permit it, we were sure of it. He took a decision in June, 1982 and not earlier to that. These are all the facts. We have no intention to suppress any facts. But at the same time, when I make a statement I must make the statement with responsibility. As on that date when the Government of India's policy was not known to me I cannot say that we have approved the projects. I can only say that that is under active consideration of the Government.

MR. SPEAKER.—In the light of this clarification it would have been proper had he made a statement regarding the clearance of proposals. That care should have been taken. Earlier to the clearance you have informed the House that matter is under consideration and all that. After consideration, at least it would have been proper for the Government to make a statement of that clearance in this House, not outside, that too by the Secretary.

(Interruptions)

SRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY.—Sir, it is only the action to be taken in pursuance to the policy statement. He did not make a policy statement. These are all formalities.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಫಾರ್ಮಾಲಿಟೀಸ್ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಂವಾಗ ಕ್ಲಿಯರ್ ಆದಮೇಲೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಮನೆಗೆ ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಸೌಜನ್ಯ ಆಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು...It is a matter of propriety.

SRI C.M. IBRAHIM.—Sir, you are aware of the matter. ಎರಡೂ ಕಡೆಯವರು ಹೇಳುವುದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇಬ್ಬರನ್ನೂ ತಮ್ಮ ಚೇಂಬರ್‌ಗೆ ಕರೆಸಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್.ಆರ್. ಬೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿ.—ಮಾಜಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ಇಬ್ರಾಹಿಂರವರು ಖಾಜಿ ನ್ಯಾಯ ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ...

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ರಿಕಾರ್ಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—This is a major policy decision of the State Government

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅವರು ಡೇಟ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಮೇಲೆ ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೇಜ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ಮೂವ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರ ?

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—Sir, this is a major policy decision. So far as this State is concerned it has been an accepted policy of the State to have all hydro-electric projects under the State sector. That is an accepted policy. Even when taking up Kali project this matter was

discussed in detail in both the Houses and we did not agree to hand it over to the Government of India or to any private parties. I don't think that it has been published. I request the hon'ble Minister to give the date when it was published. I will look into the newspaper. I am still doubtful whether such a publicity is given for such a major change of policy.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—೧೧-೮-೮೧ರಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಸಚಿವ ಸಂಪುಟದಲ್ಲಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದೆ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಆಗ ಅಧಿವೇಶನ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಸರ್ಕಾರ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಗೆ ತಿಳುವಳಿಕೆ ಬರುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಆಗಿದೆ. You please search if there is any statement. If that is not there, you take advantage of it.

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—Sir, my point is, such a major change in policy decision should have been intimated to this House.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ದಯಮಾಡಿ ಕೇಳಿ, ೧೧-೮-೮೧ರಲ್ಲಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹೇಳದೆ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದರೆ ತಮ್ಮ ವಾದ ಸರಿಯಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಸಪರೇಟಾಗಿ ಈ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರೆ ತಾವು ಹೇಳುವ ಅರ್ಥ ಸರಿಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಕ್ವಾಲಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್.ಆರ್. ಬೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿ.—ಅನೇಕ ಖಾಸಗಿಯವರು ಮುಂದೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಅವಕಾಶಕ್ಕೆ ಅಡ್ಡಿಯಾಯಿತು. ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಗೆ ತಪ್ಪು ತಿಳುವಳಿಕೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಉದ್ಯಮಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಅದು ಮುಖ್ಯ. ಮೂರು ಜನರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಸಿಗುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಕೊಡುವ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಏನಿತ್ತು ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು. ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ, ತಾ. ೧೧-೮-೮೧ರಂದು ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದೆ ಎಂದು. ಈ ರೀತಿಯ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಹಕ್ಕು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಇದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಾವು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೀರಾ ಅಲ್ಲವೇ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ವೀರಪ್ಪ ಮೊಯ್ಲಿ.—ಯಾರಿಗೋ ತಮಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಇಟ್ಟು ಕೊಂಡು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. If there are some proposals from your side, we are prepared to consider.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್.ಆರ್. ಬೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿ.—ಕ್ಯಾಬಿನೆಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಮೂರು ಕಂಪನಿಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿರಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಆ ಕಂಪನಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಮೊದಲೇ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಗೊತ್ತಿತ್ತು ? ಅವರು ಮೊದಲೇ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಅಪ್ಲೈ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರು ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾ. ೧೧-೮-೮೧ರಂದು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡ ತೀರ್ಮಾನದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪತ್ರಿಕಾ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಬಂದಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. State is made known of the policy. Applications were there which were not cleared on the date of the budget speech. Therefore, we have made the statement that the Government has come to a decision ಎಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್.ಆರ್. ಬೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿ.—ತಾ. ೧೧-೮-೮೧ರಂದು ಈ ಮೂರು ಕಂಪನಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸ್ ಕೊಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ರೆಕಮೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಕ್ಯಾಬಿನೆಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿಯ ಪಾಲಿಸಿ ಡಿಸಿಷನ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವಾಗ ಬೇರೆಯವರೂ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲ ? ಇದರ ಹಿನ್ನೆಲೆ ಬಹಳ ಗಂಭೀರವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಬೇರೆಯವರಿಗೂ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಹಾಕಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು.

MR. SPEAKER.—The notice given yesterday was only in respect of the policy statement made by the Secretary outside the House. I have to exercise my jurisdiction to a limited extent. That notice does not survive in view of the clarifications made by the Government ಆದರೆ ತಾವು ಇವೊತ್ತು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ನೋಟೀಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತಾ. ೧೧-೮-೧೯೮೧ರಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರು, ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾರ್ಚ್ ತಿಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ಭಾಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ ಈಗ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಮನೆಯನ್ನ ತಪ್ಪು ದಾರಿಗೆ ಎಳೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬುದು ತಮ್ಮ ವಾದವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಏನು ಕ್ಲಾರಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದರೆ, ಕಳೆದ ಆಗಸ್ಟ್ ತಿಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರೂ ಸಹ ಬಂದಂಥ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಇನ್ನೂ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲವಾದ ಕಾರಣ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ಭಾಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಮತ್ತು ಕಳೆದ ಆಗಸ್ಟ್ ತಿಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್.ಆರ್. ಬೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿ.—ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡ ಮೇಲೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕು. ಆದರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ಭಾಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಇದನ್ನು ಪರಿತೀಲಿಸುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಬಂದಂಥ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್.ಆರ್. ಬೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿ.—ಅದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ವಿವರವಾಗಿ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ಭಾಷಣದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಇಂತಿಂತಹ ಕಂಪನಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಶಿಫಾರಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಅದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲ. ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದರೆ ನಾವೂ ಸಹ ಆ ಕಂಪನಿಗಳಂ ಯಾವುವು ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದು ಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಒಂದಂ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಲೋಕೋಪಯೋಗಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಂ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅಭಾರ ಮನ್ನಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ, ಅವರು ಹೇಳದಿದ್ದರೆ ನಮಗೆ ಇದೆಲ್ಲಾ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತಲೇ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಜನತೆಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ನಮಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಉಪಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂಥಾ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಸಭೆ ನಡೆಯುವಾಗ ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಹೇಳಬಾರದು. ಆದರೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ನಾವು ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಲೋಕೋಪಯೋಗಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಸಹ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ತಾವು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ನೋಟೀಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೆಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಚಾರಗಳು ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ವಾದರೂ ಸಹ ತಾವು ವಿವರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ತಮಗೆ ಈಗ ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಚಾರಗಳೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡಿ. In view of the clarifications both these notices do not survive.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ.ಸಿ. ನಾನಯ್ಯ.—ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ಭಾಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

MR. SPEAKER.—Hon. Minister has not suppressed facts. He said that the decision was taken on such and such a date. It was given publicity in the paper.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ.ಸಿ. ನಾನಯ್ಯ.—ಈ ವಿಚಾರ ಮೊದಲೇ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾವು ಅದನ್ನು ಹುಡುಕುತ್ತೇವೆ. ನಂತರ ಮತ್ತೆ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಆದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಮತ್ತೆ ಇವರು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಲಿ.

MR. SPEAKER.—In view of the clarifications given by Hon. Minister for Finance, I withhold my consent in respect of both the Notices since they do not survive. ಈಗ ನಗರಾಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಇಲಾಖೆ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ನಡೆದ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ.